REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 17, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claim 12 is hereby amended to correct dependency. Claims 4, 6, and 8 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-15 are currently pending. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Office rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention, specifically claim 12 is dependent on canceled claim 8. *Office Action* at p. 2. The Applicant has amended claim 12 to correct its dependency. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection of claims 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Office rejects claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,105,533 to Boos *et al.* (hereinafter "*Boos*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,932,091 to Day *et al.* (hereinafter "*Day*") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,194,824 to Wang *et al.* (hereinafter "*Wang*"). *Office Action* at p. 2. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Wang's foreign application priority date is November 17, 2003. However, because *Wang* does not claim the benefit of an International Application, *Wang*'s earliest priority date is the U.S. filing date of July 23, 2004. Thus, *Wang* does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as the present application claims the benefit of International Application No. PCT/KR2005/001539, filed May 25, 2005 and Korean Application No. 2004-0041111, filed on June 5, 2004. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully assert that *Wang* must be withdrawn from use in the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-15.

Independent claim 1 is allowable in that it recites, at least, "a lift coupled to an inner circumference of the drum main body to lift the laundry, wherein the cylindrical portion is

provided with at least one penetration hole that is a predetermined distance apart from the first end and the second end of the drum main body, and wherein the lift is provided at a bottom surface with a positioning projection to be inserted into the penetration hole." *Boos* and *Day*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

Without necessarily agreeing to the Office's assertion that, "it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings or Boos with...Day," or that *Boos* and *Day* teach what is suggested by the Office, and in an effort to advance the application to allowance, Applicant submits that the Office admits that neither *Boos* or *Day*, in combination or alone, discloses, "a lift coupled to an inner circumference of the drum main body to lift the laundry, wherein the cylindrical portion is provided with at least one penetration hole that is a predetermined distance apart from the first end and the second end of the drum main body, and wherein the lift is provided at a bottom surface with a positioning projection to be inserted into the penetration hole." *Office Action* at p. 3. Thus, nowhere does *Boos or Day,* teach or suggest, at least, "a lift coupled to an inner circumference of the drum main body to lift the laundry, wherein the cylindrical portion is provided with at least one penetration hole that is a predetermined distance apart from the first end and the second end of the drum main body, and wherein the lift is provided at a bottom surface with a positioning projection to be inserted into the penetration hole," as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Boos* in view of *Day*. It stands to reason that claims 2-3, 5, 7, and 9-15, which depend from independent claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-15.

The Office also rejects claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-15 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 7,395,612 to Jeong *et al.* (hereinafter "*Jeong '612*"). *Office Action* at p. 4. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-15 are not obvious in view of claims 1-33 of *Jeong '612* because they are not coextensive in scope.

More specifically, Claim 1 recites a drum assembly of a laundry dryer which includes, among other features, "a lift coupled to an inner circumference of the drum main body to lift the laundry, wherein the cylindrical portion is provided with at least one penetration hole that is a predetermined distance apart from the first end and the second end of the drum main body, and wherein the lift is provided at a bottom surface with a positioning projection to be inserted into the penetration hole" The Applicant submits that *Jeong '612* does not claim these features.

Apart from the fact that *Jeong '612* does not disclose all of the feature of claim 1, the Office merely alleges that "it would have been an obvious to one skilled in the art to recite the claimed seam weld process." The Office does not address how all of the features of independent claim 1 are rendered obvious by claims 1-33 of *Jeong '612*.

Thus, absent a claim by the Office regarding at least the above features, claims 1-33 of *Jeong '612* are patentably distinct from the instant claimed invention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-15 over claims 1-33 of the *Jeong '612* patent be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: June 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By_____

Yong S. Choi
Registration No.: 43,324
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant